Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

physical defects, a problem exacerbated by the epidemic of teenage pregnancies in Chicago and other urban areas.

In light of those sobering facts, I am heartened to report that concerned citizens are responding aggressively to this continuing national tragedy. On March 22, the Metropolitan Chicago chapter of the March of Dimes will hold their annual "Salute to Babies" banquet to raise funds for the battle against infant mortality and birth defects.

The proceeds from this outstanding event will fund education programs for expectant parents, health workers and the public; a variety of pilot projects and development of perinatal infant intensive care units; and research to prevent preterm births, low birth weight and birth defects.

The "Salute to Babies" was founded by Dr. Effie O. Ellis, a renowned pediatrician and leader in the quest for quality maternal and infant health care. Throughout her distinguished career in research and public health, Dr. Ellis has devoted herself tirelessley to the reduction of risk in the delivery room.

I ask you to join me in commending this American hero and others who are working to improve the odds for our infants of the future through activities like the "Salute to Babies."●

LOUIS J. KAPLAN RETIRES FROM YALE UNIVERSITY

● Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, the end of this month marks the retirement from Yale University of a man who has done much to effect a solid and productive partnership between Yale and its local, State, and Federal Governments.

That man, Louis J. Kaplan, associate medical dean for community, government relations, and alumni affairs, has since 1965 worked tirelessly as an advocate for biomedical research and medical education. In increasingly responsible positions at Yale, Lou has been an invaluable resource for Connecticut's elected officials on the activities of the university community in particular and the needs of medicine in general.

Active in human services work since he earned undergraduate and graduate degrees from New York University, Lou began his career with youngsters at the Madison Square Boys Club in New York City. And he never lost his sensitivity to or concern for the individual. Whether working to improve services to Connecticut's mentally ill, communicating the needs of minority students to the medical school, or marshaling the resources of Yale to meet the health needs of the Hill community, Lou acted because he saw an individual in need. While at the university his concerns expanded to the whole range of medical service questions and it is due, in no small part to his efforts, that one of our Nation's comprehensive cancer centers is established at the university.

I commend Lou Kaplan for the many and critical insights he has provided me and my colleagues over the years. His careful and considered competence have contributed substantially to the improved quality of life we all seek.●

IN MEMORY OF JAMES PATTON

● Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, rural Americans have lost a great champion, and I have lost a friend. James G. Patton, a Farmers Union activist for 52 of his 82 years, died Sunday, February 17, in Palo Alto, CA, from the effects of a stroke he had suffered last December 10.

James Patton was one of the most important agricultural leaders of the 20th century. It was Patton that pioneered in the concept that a farm organization had to be concerned about and try to effect the totality of the circumstances of living in rural areas. He was in many ways an anchor around which coalitions formed to work on farm policy, education, health care, and quality of life issues during those critical years during and after the Depression and into the 1980's.

I knew James Patton while I was a Farmers Union activist and after I became an elected official. I found him to be always a compassionate man as well as a skilled and brilliant leader, even though we had our differences from time to time. Mostly, those differences involved the operation of the Farmers Union, rather than its goals.

James George Patton was born in Bazar, KS, in November 1902.

Patton was an insurance salesman in 1932 in Colorado when he proposed to the Colorado Farmers Union that it develop a cooperative insurance program. He was hired to manage that activity and went on to become secretary and then president of the Colorado Farmers Union.

Patton served as president of the National Farmers Union from 1940 to 1966.

He strongly advocated international commodity agreements, world food reserves, and aid to emerging nations.

His proposals for world food aid programs helped develop the concept of the Food-for-Peace program.

In domestic agriculture, Patton was an advocate of stronger farm program measures, an exponent of parity for family farmers, and a defender of the Farm Security Administration and the farmer-elected committee system.

James Patton is survived by his wife, Nathalie, one son, one daughter, two sisters, and several grandchildren. My heart goes out to each of them.

Patton was physically a big man, with a commanding presence. He leaves us with many fond memories, many dreams, and, I hope, a renewed sense of mission.●

TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE SHULTZ ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to share with you the testimony of Secretary of State George Shultz on Friday, March 15, 1985, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This testimony addresses foreign assistance in general and the foreign assistance authorization for fiscal year 1986. I ask that the testimony be printed in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

I. OPENING

Mr. Chairman and distinguished member of this committee, I know that we agree on the need for prudent investments abroad to enhance our national security, promote economic and political freedom, and reflect the humanitarian concerns of the American people. Foreign assistance is such an investment. Yet our foreign assistance request for FY 1986 comes before this Committee at a time when this Administration and the Congress are committed to bringing our budget deficits down. As a former budget director, perhaps I am more sympathetic than most to the immense challenge this poses and the painful choices that will have to be made.

Recognizing the overriding importance of reducing the budget deficit, we have carefully constructed our economic and military assistance program to a level and mix that represent the minimum requirements to support our foreign policy objectives.

At the same time, we must bear in mind that our foreign assistance programs are vital to the achievement of our foreign policy goals. A world of peace, freedom, international stability, and human progress cannot be built by the United States alone. We need the support and cooperation of the many friends and allies around the world who share or hopes and dreams of a better world, and who rely on us. And if we are to count on their support in facing the difficult and sometimes dangerous challenges of the modern world, we must ourselves be a reliable partner. We must be consistent in our devotion to the principles we cherish and proclaim: to promote prosperity, to defend freedom, to help build democracy and respect for human rights, to help alleviate suffering, and to protect our friends and allies against aggression.

In his State of the Union address, President Reagan noted that "dollar for dollar, our security assistance contributes as much to global security as our own defense budget." Strengthening our friends is one of the most effective ways of protecting our interests and furthering our goals. It gives them the ability and the confidence to defend themselves and to work for peace. If we are willing to pay the relatively modest cost and make the necessary sacrifices today, we can avoid far greater costs and sacrifices in the future. Foreign assistance is a prudent investment in or future, and the world's future.

When I appeared before this distinguished Committee last year, I sought to show how closely linked our foreign assistance programs are to our most fundamental policy goals.

The events over the past two years have convinced me more than ever before that we are on the right track. We have strengthened our relationships with our friends in the developing world against Soviet expansionism. We have seen a number of develop-

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

ing countries move toward free and more open economies. Increasingly, the world recognizes that statist economic systems do not work. Free market economies do. And we have witnessed extraordinary progress in the growth of democratic institutions and in the decline of dictatorships, particularly in our own hemisphere.

It is no coincidence that along with the emergence of freer socieities we see more open economies. One supports and reinforces the other. People, if they have a choice, want economic growth. They want prosperity. They need only the personal security and the political and economic environment that allows them to exercise their will and use their talents. Our support for the security and territorial integrity of our friends, therefore, advances the most basic human goals of prosperity and freedom. But it also advances another goal, peace. We have seen over the years that economic progress, individual liberty, and world peace are closely related. As President Reagan said in his Second Inaugural Address: "America must remain freedom's staunchest friend, for freedom is our best ally and it is the world's only hope to conquer poverty and preserve peace. Every blow we inflict against poverty will be a blow against its dark allies of oppression and war. Every victory for human freedom will be a victory for world peace."

Today we are seeing developments in the Third World which, if we continue to nurture them, will lead to a more secure and prosperous world. There will inevitably be occasional setbacks, but if we stay the course, I believe the emerging pattern of stable and democratic governments will slowly but inexorably grow and be strengthened.

Much remains to be done. The most effective contribution we can make to the developing world is to maintain a healthy American economy. Our economic growth rate in 1983 was a prime reason for the sharp increase in U.S. imports from the non-OPEC developing countries to $92.3 billion, some 24% over the previous year. The developing nations will reap even more substantial benefits from the vigorous growth of our economy in 1984.

More than any other factor, however, the domestic policies of these countries will determine the strength and sustainability of their economies and their political institutions. Our foreign assistance can provide those critical incremental resources to help them achieve these objectives.

With this framework in mind, we have engaged in an exhaustive budget review process to assure that the sum of our resources and each individual component are the absolute minimum essential to implement and support our foreign policy.

II. OVERVIEW OF 1986 BUDGET

The FY 1986 budget request for the International Affairs Function is $19.3 billion. Of that amount, the foreign assistance request totals $14.8 billion, a $300 million reduction from the FY 1985 Continuing Resolution level. As I will explain later, we have yet to determine the economic assistance level for Israel. When that assistance figure is eventually included, our request will be higher than the previous year. Economic assistance, which includes Development Assistance, PL 480, the Economic Support Fund, and contributions to multilateral development institutions, accounts for $8.2 billion. Military assistance, which includes military grants, loans, and training, totals $6.6 billion.

The remaining $4.5 billion requested for the International Affairs Function principally finances the operation of the Department of State, USIA, the Export-Import Bank, the Board of International Broadcasting, our assessed contributions to international organizations, contributions to U.N. peacekeeping activities, and U.S. participation in multilateral international conferences.

Within the International Affairs Function, some appropriation accounts would receive an increase under our request, while others would decline. The function 150 total, however, is well below the FY 1985 enacted level. This will remain true even with an add-on for Israel that we may request in the coming weeks. These increases and decreases among individual appropriation accounts reflect the priorities of the Administration and the "budget freeze" philosophy that was applied to this year's budget process. They also reflect our efforts to distribute our scarce resources in a way that will maximize our foreign policy returns and help meet the pressing development and security needs of our strategic partners. Our FY 1986 foreign assistance request contains only one modest new initiative—an enhanced economic aid package for the Andean democracies of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia. With that one exception, our 1986 budget request by and large represents a continuity program, reflecting both the overall fiscal constraints under which we are operating and the fact that many of our earlier initiatives—especially in Central America—are now well underway and beginning to show progress.

As in the past, the largest single component of our foreign assistance request is for Israel and Egypt—twenty eight percent (28%) of the total. This percentage, of course, will be higher when we include economic assistance funds for Israel. Assistance to base rights countries—Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey and the Philippines—accounts for an additional sixteen percent (16%), while military access and frontline states such as Korea and Thailand take up another thirteen percent (13%). Central America and the Caribbean represent another eleven percent (11%) of the request. All other country programs account for only twelve percent (12%) of the total resources requested. This twelve percent, however, is spread among more than eighty separate countries and regional programs. Finally, contributions to multilateral development institutions and voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs make up ten percent (10%) of the request, with the remainder of the amounts requested going to the Peace Corps, migration and refugee assistance, international narcotics control activities and a number of smaller programs.

Turning to the specifics of our request, I would like to make the following brief observations:

In Development Assistance, we are requesting $2.1 billion to attack serious conditions of poverty in Africa and Asia, Latin America and the Near East, and to help establish the basic conditions for economic progress. We place heavy emphasis on policy reform, greater use of the private sector, and on technology transfer to foster development breakthroughs. These economic programs are a critical aspect of our overall foreign policy objectives.

Closely related to the Development Assistance request is a request for $1.3 billion in PL 480 for food assistance and balance of payments support to friendly governments. Food aid remains the centerpiece of the American people's humanitarian response to the tragic famine conditions in Africa.

The $2.8 billion requested for the Economic Support Fund is $1 billion below the amount appropriated in the FY 1985 Continuing Resolution. This is due in part to the fact that we have deferred making any ESF request for Israel at this time. I will elaborate on the question of economic assistance to Israel later in my remarks.

Our request for military assistance—that is, direct Foreign Military Sales credits and grant MAP—is $860 million more than was appropriated in 1985. Most of this increase, $525 million, is accounted for by higher levels for Israel ($1.8 billion as opposed to $1.4 billion in 1985) and Egypt ($1.3 billion as opposed to $1.2 billion). In addition, our military assistance request for Turkey has been increased from the 1985 level of $700 million to $785 million. For the Philippines, we are requesting a $75 million increase over the FY 1985 level.

The $2.9 billion requested for the State Department budget includes critically important funds to enhance our security program in the face of increasing terrorist threats against U.S. personnel and facilities. Additional funds are also requested to expand and improve the Department's ability to obtain and interpret foreign policy information.

III. THE REGIONS

Latin America and the Caribbean

Mr. Chairman, nowhere has the linkage between foreign assistance and U.S. national interests—and between democracy and economic opportunity—been better illustrated than in Latin America and the Caribbean. The past year has provided clear evidence that democratic development, and the rejection of the Communist left and the far right, are the keys to enduring peace and improving standard of living for all.

Our policy of lending political, economic, and military assistance to pro-democratic forces is working. Let us look at the record.

In 1979, four of the five Central American countries were undemocratic. Six years have produced dramatic change. Nicaragua remains under a dictatorship—having traded a tyrant of the right for the tyranny of the left—and Costa Rica remains thoroughly democratic—though increasingly and justifiably concerned about its heavily armed Communist neighbor. But, an unprecedented transformation has taken place in the rest of Central America.

El Salvador has undergone the most dramatic change. As recently as a year ago, the country appeared caught in an endless war between guerrillas of the left and death squads of the right. But as the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America found, electoral democracy and political dialogue—*not* externally imposed "power sharing" between guerrillas and governments—proved to be the practical basis for attacking the seamless web of El Salvador's political, economic, social, and security problems. In turn, increased economic and security assistance were necessary to give democracy, reform, and economic revitalization a fighting chance.

Last year demonstrated that President Duarte's course was *the* route most likely to lead to greater respect for human rights and a better life. The Salvadorans themselves made the point in two rounds of national elections in 1984. And they did it again in a different dimension when a civilian jury found five former National Guardsmen guilty of the murders of the four American churchwomen. Support for this democratic renewal was backed unanimously by the National Bipartisan Commission, by President Reagan, by a bipartisan majority in the Congress, and in Europe by Social Democrats as well as Christian Democrats.

It would be naive to claim that *all* is now reformed, centrist, and peaceful in El Salva-

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

dor. But the progress is significant and undeniable. U.S. firmness on principle and steadfastness on behalf of our Salvadoran friends has had a lot to do with it.

The recent history of Guatemala exemplifies the strength of the currents of change in the region. The country conventional wisdom has often ranked as "the most polarized" or with the "least chance of democratic development" in Central America has founded the conventionalists. The Constituent Assembly elections seven months ago were not only widely accepted as honest and open, but—to the surprise of many—revealed that centrist forces constitute the political majority. Elections for President, Vice President, Congress and local offices have been set for October. It is encouraging that the Guatemalans are moving in this direction almost exclusively on their own.

There is one issue, however, on which considerable controversy still reigns: Nicaragua. While we are promoting democratic reform throughout Central America, the Sandinista leaders in Nicaragua are moving quickly, with Soviet-bloc and Cuban help, to consolidate their totalitarian power. Should they achieve this primary goal, we could confront a second Cuba in this hemisphere, this time on the Central American mainland—with all the strategic dangers that this implies. If history is any guide, the Sandinistas would then intensify their efforts to undermine neighboring governments in the name of their revolutionary principles—which Fidel Castro himself flatly reaffirmed on American television several weeks ago. Needless to say, the first casualty of the consolidation of Sandinista power would be the freedom and homes for democracy of the Nicaraguan people. The second casualty would be the security of Nicaragua's neighbors, and the security of the entire region.

I do not believe anyone in the United States wants to see this scenario unfold. Nicaragua's immediate neighbors—Costa Rica, El Salvador and Honduras—have been increasingly emphatic in telling us how dangerous to them that scenario would be. Yet there are those here who would look the other way, imagining that the problem will disappear by itself. There are those who would grant the Sandinistas a peculiar kind of immunity in our legislation—in effect, enacting the Brezhnev Doctrine into American law.

The democratic forces in Nicaragua are on the front line in the struggle for progress, security, and freedom in Central America. Our active help for them is the best insurance that their efforts will be directed consistently and effectively toward these objectives.

Communist dictatorships feel free to aid and abet insurgencies in the spurious guise of supporting "liberation". Democracies, the true target of this threat, must not be inhibited from defending their interests and the cause of democracy itself.

Peace and economic development in Central America require both the reliability of multi-year funding and the confidence that this long-term commitment will continue to be tied to equity, reform, and freedom. Bipartisan support is essential if the Central America Initiative is to address the Bipartisan Commission's call for a commitment through 1989 to provide—in a consistent predictable way—a balanced and mutually reinforcing mix of economic, political, diplomatic, and security activities.

This initiative is designed to use economic aid, coupled with sufficient policy reform, to eliminate the root causes of poverty and political unrest. Much work is already underway. Discussions are taking place with recipient countries concerning macro-economic adjustment. Progress has been made toward economic stabilization. Regional technical training programs will begin in April. We have begun to work with governments and non-governmental organizations seeking to improve the administration of justice. A trade credit insurance program has been set up through AID and the Export-Import Bank. The revival and strengthening of the Central America Bank for Economic Integration is being studied. And we are working to assist in the revival of the Central American Common Market.

The democratic trend in the Andean region has been equally impressive. All five countries have democratically elected governments. But like their Latin neighbors to the north, many of their economies are being seriously challenged.

Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, have been particularly hard hit by the recent global recession. Their difficulties have been exacerbated by catastrophic weather conditions, sagging prices for their main exports, and, in Peru, a vicious Maoist guerrilla movement.

These countries deserve our help and it is in our interest to help them. We are proposing a special Andean program principally supported by $70 million in Economic Support Funds to assist these countries in their recovery efforts.

A democracy incapable of addressing major economic problems will be no more permanent than the dictators of the right or left that it has replaced.

We are encouraged that our neighbors in Latin America for the most part are taking the necessary and often painful steps to ensure economic revitalization. They have lowered government expenditures, bringing them in line with government income. They have restricted imports of non-essential goods to save foreign exchange. They have adjusted their exchange rates to reflect economic reality and breathe new life into their export sectors. They have worked with the international financial community to restructure their debts and ensure continued orderly debt servicing. They have reallocated scarce resources even as those resources fell.

The efforts are beginning to show results. The trade balance for Latin America with the rest of the world has improved significantly, recovering from a negative $2 billion in 1981 to an estimated positive $37.6 billion in 1984. Vigorous U.S. economic growth in 1984 created new export opportunities. There also has been growth in real per capita income of about 0.2 percent in 1984—not much, but better than the decline of 5.8 percent in 1983 and 3.3 percent in 1982.

The Caribbean Basin Initiative is showing some positive signs. U.S. non-petroleum imports from the region for the first 11 months of 1984 were up 19 percent over 1983. The open U.S. market continues to offer substantial opportunities for region's exports.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, I believe that the Administration and the Congress have reason to conclude that the policies we have been following the last four years are succeeding. The best option for the next four years is to continue these efforts based on firm, bipartisan support.

The lessons from the recent past and the guidelines for the near future can be condensed into an assertion: The skeptics were wrong about El Salvador, they were wrong about Grenada, and they are wrong about Nicaragua—and all for the same reasons. Mr. Chairman, what the Administration and the Congress have learned together about Central America in the recent past provides a mandate for the future. The Administration cannot fulfill that mandate without the active support of the Congress. If you and we do not stand firmly on principle and with our friends, we will both lose. A lack of policy consistency would be a significant obstacle to achieving our national objectives in this region over the next months and years.

Africa

I turn now from the promising developments in Latin America to a region where problems continue to be grave. Africa's desperate economic state is more in the public eye than it has ever been. I would like to devote the major portion of my discussion of Africa today to the economic crisis. In doing so, I do not mean to minimize the relationship between economic development and the national security of African states. Security assistance remains essential for many African countries. States threatened by Libyan Adventurism or Soviet-armed hostile neighbors cannot devote the energy or resources necessary to economic development. And economically fragile societies are most vulnerable to subversion and attack.

Our total FY 1986 request for Africa is just over $1.2 billion. Of that amount 17% is for military-related assistance, roughly the same amount as in FY 85. The overwhelming majority—over one billion dollars—is for economic assistance. While the military component is small, it is nevertheless extremely important if we are to continue the programs of logistics support and training that we have started and if we are to provide the bare minimum in the way of defense equipment for our friends facing threats. The proximity of the Horn of Africa to the Middle East and vital oil shipping routes in the Red Sea and the Indian Oceans adds a critical strategic dimension to our interests in creating a politically stable and economically viable environment in the region. Consequently, we are seeking the resources necessary to assist Sudan, Kenya, Somalia, and Djibouti cope with their flat economies and to help Sudan and Somalia counter the very real threats to their security.

In southern Africa we continue to work diligently toward a just and lasting settlement for Namibia based on UN Security Council Resolution 435, for continued change in the repugnant system of apartheid in South Africa, and for the economic and political stability of the region in general. The funds that we are requesting for programs in southern African countries will enable us to strike directly at the causes of the economic difficulties of the region. In southern Africa, as in East Africa, we intend to thwart the destabilizing influence of the Soviet Union and East Bloc by providing economic assistance and by offering an alternative to Soviet and East Bloc military assistance and training. Mozambique has demonstrated a real intent to move away from heavy dependence upon the Soviet Union and toward a position of true nonalignment. The small MAP and IMET programs for Mozambique are of particular importance in encouraging this process.

In West Africa we have recently seen the spread of both the effects of the drought and long-term economic stagnation and Libyan adventurism. Our assistance is targeted against both the near-term crisis and the long-range effects of the economic crisis.

I would like to focus specifically on the two most urgent crises facing Africa today: famine and economic stagnation. During recent months, untold thousands of Africans have perished. We estimate that some 14 million Africans remain at risk. If they are to survive, they need urgent assistance in terms of food, medical care, and shelter.

There is also the broader problem of malnutrition. An estimated 20 percent of Afri-

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

ca's population eats less than the minimum needed to sustain good health. Africa is the only region in the world where per capita food production has declined over the past two decades—a combination of a drop in productivity and rapidly growing population. Africa's food dependency on outside sources has been growing at an alarming pace, with African commercial imports of grain increasing at a rate of nine percent per year during the past twenty years.

In addition to the current severe food crisis, Africa's disappointing economic performance has made it difficult for most African countries to service their debt, propelling many countries from one financial crisis to another. The economic crisis has required that African nations regularly seek debt rescheduling. Ten of the fourteen Paris Club reschedulings in 1984 were for African countries.

The United States has mounted an unprecedented campaign to provide both economic and emergency food assistance to Africa. In this effort, we have not allowed political or ideological differences with any government to weaken our determination to direct assistance to those in need. Since October of last year, we have committed more than $400 million to send over one million tons of emergency food and other types of humanitarian assistance to Africa. If we add our regular AID food programs, then our total food assistance for Africa is even larger—almost 600 million dollars thus far this fiscal year. I think we can be justifiably proud of what we have been able to accomplish in such a short period of time. I assure you that our response will continue to be a generous one.

Equally impressive has been the direct response of the American people and the private sector. Through generous contributions to private agencies, many thousands of additional lives have been, and continue to be, saved. Volunteers for these agencies are directly involved in distributing food, medicines, clothing, and shelter and caring for drought victims in the most remote parts of Africa, enduring extreme hardships and even risking their own lives. Such humanitarian assistance is in the best tradition of America and the values for which America stands.

Public attention has focused on the immediate drought crisis, but it is apparent that Africa's economic difficulties have a profound origin that goes back many years.

Drought has aggravated the problem, but is not the principal cause of Africa's economic crisis. Many of the African governments recognize that past policy failures have contributed to the current economic crisis. While we seek to address the immediate crisis, therefore, we must also seek more sustainable solutions to Africa's economic problems. The United States has been in the forefront of those seeking to help African countries move from a statist economic orientation to one which allows market forces to operate freely and which provides appropriate price incentives, particularly to the small farmers. Structural issues which are being addressed include inefficient parastatals, overvalued exchange rates, negative interest rates on bank deposits, uneconomic subsidies to consumers and artificially low prices to producers. In addition to the emergency assistance to meet the drought and famine needs, U.S. economic assistance levels for Africa have increased from $787 million in FY 1981 to over $1 billion in FY 1985; for FY 1986 we are again asking for a total of $1 billion in economic aid. The Administration has established two new programs to assist African governments to undertake desirable reforms.

Last year the Administration requested $75 million as the first step in a five year $500 million program designed to provide additional financial support for selected African countries who are undertaking significant economic reforms.

We are currently discussing use of these funds for possible programs with four African countries: Zambia, Malawi, Mali and Rwanda, and may choose a fifth country later. In each of these four countries our programs will facilitate and accelerate major policy reforms designed to stimulate economic growth through agricultural production and reduced governmental impediments to efficient utilization of limited economic resources.

In our FY 86 budget submission we are seeking a second appropriation of $75 million. Economic reform has become a major part of our dialogue with all African countries, and facilitated with many aspects of our regular program. However, implementing some of these reforms requires timely support of flexible funds, not tied to other long-term projects. This is what this $75 million is for. The experience of the past few months indicates that there is major international support for this program in Africa and in other donor countries.

The flexibility provided over this program has permitted us to have an impact on policies of donors and recipients alike which far exceeds the modest amount of funds involved in this request. I can think of no other single aspect of our assistance activities which more directly bears on the factors that have contributed to what is commonly called "the African Economic Crisis." An increasing number of African countries are beginning to alter in a fundamental way their national economic policies. Above all, the relevance of free market economies as opposed to statist solutions has become clear to African leaders as never before.

I might just add that our perception of the roots of Africa's current economic crisis is widely shared by the international community. We are particularly pleased with the World Bank's latest report on sub-Saharan Africa and its stress on the need for economic reform to reverse Africa's economic decline. The World Bank recently launched its own Special Facility which will provide financial support to reform-minded countries—a facility which complements and reinforces our efforts.

The "Food for Progress" initiative recently announced by the President is also targeted at achieving policy reform, but exclusively in the agricultural sector. This initiative would use food aid in strategically important African countries to promote reform in the key agricultural sector, stressing market approaches in agricultural pricing, marketing, and the supply and distribution of fertilizer, seeds and other agricultural inputs. One of the goals of the initiative is to supply American food to reform-minded countries on a multi-year basis. The sale of the commodities on the local economies would provide resources for the governments to use in supplying needed incentives and inputs to the farmers while easing the effects on urban consumers of moving toward a market economy. The details of this proposal, including funding levels and sources, will be transmitted to the Congress shortly.

Near East and South Asia

One of the most important foreign policy goals of this Administration is to help achieve a lasting peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors. There are no quick and easy solutions for peace in the Middle East, but our assistance plays a crucial role in furthering the peace process.

In recent weeks, there appears to have been movement in the region of the type which, if sustained, could facilitate Jordanian entry into direct negotiations with Israel based on UN Security Council Resolution 242. Israel's Prime Minister Peres has welcomed Egyptian President Mubarak's call for direct negotiations between Israel and a Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. Saudi Arabia's King Fahd and President Reagan in their recent discussions, agreed that stable peace must provide security for all states in the area and for the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. We will support any practical effort to move the Arab-Israeli dispute to the negotiating table, the sooner the better.

Israel and Egypt remain our principal partners in the quest for peace, and these two nations would be the largest recipients of our proposed foreign assistance for Fiscal Year 1986. Our economic and military assistance programs are needed to strengthen Jordan's security and economy, both of which are vital to enable Jordan to confront the risks involved in playing a significant role in the peace process. Our relationships with Saudi Arabia and the Arab Gulf States are important elements in our efforts to advance the peace process and, as I will mention later, to protect our interest in the Persian Gulf.

The United States has a commitment to Israel's security extending over three decades. Our security assistance proposal aims to ease the onerous burden Israel shoulders in meeting its defense needs. The Fiscal Year 1986 Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program will enable Israel to maintain a qualitative military edge over potential adversaries in the region. Further progress towards peace depends in part on Israel having sufficient confidence in its ability to withstand external threats but also confidence in U.S. support and assistance. For these reasons, we are recommending a significant increase in Foreign Military Sales on a grant basis for Israel.

The U.S. and Israeli governments agreed last October to establish a Joint Economic Development Group to review economic developments in Israel, the role of U.S. assistance in support of the Israeli adjustment program, and Israeli long-term development objectives. At a meeting in December, Israeli government officials presented the annual White Paper outlining Israeli economic objectives and assistance requirements for the remainder of this fiscal year and for FY 1986.

Our security assistance is a reflection of the U.S. commitment to Israel's security and economic well-being. In addition, we have indicated our willingness to provide extraordinary assistance in support of a comprehensive Israeli economic program that deals effectively with the fundamental imbalances in the Israeli economy. Without such a reform program, however, additional U.S. assistance would not resolve Israel's economic problems but merely help perpetuate them. Moreover, without economic adjustment Israel will become even more dependent on U.S. assistance in the future. The Israeli government has made some considerable progress to date in developing an adjustment program. But further progress is necessary if their program is to put Israel back on the path of economic health and additional U.S. assistance is to have a durable effect. Accordingly, the Administration intends to hold open for the time being the amount and form of ESF which we will be requesting from the Congress pending further discussions with Israel and further evolution of its stabilization program.

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

We held a series of very useful discussions recently with Israeli Minister of Finance Modai on Israel's current efforts and those it hopes to take in the future. These discussions were a very useful contribution to our dialogue, which is continuing, and a step forward in our consideration of how additional U.S. economic assistance could support an effective Israeli stabilization program.

Our discussions will continue to focus not only on short term stabilization measures, but also on Israel's longer range development objectives so that Israeli citizens can have confidence in a brighter, more prosperous future. We agreed during Prime Minister Peres' visit last October to work together to promote foreign investment in Israel, particularly in the high technology area where Israel has a comparative advantage. Both governments are examining existing programs and frameworks which might help to improve Israel's investment climate and attract venture capital from abroad. It is clear that in Israel's case—as in other countries—mobilizing both domestic and foreign venture capital depends on an atmosphere that encourages private enterprise, appropriate tax structures and market pricing policies. Private sector initiatives hold the greatest promise for helping Israel achieve its development goals, and we are encouraged by the interest that has been generated in both countries. Our real objective is to support Israel's own efforts to seize the opportunity to establish the fundamental conditions for economic growth in an age of new technology.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how much I admire the great efforts that Prime Minister Peres and his colleagues have been making in struggling not only with Israel's current economic problems, but other problems in Lebanon, in the peace process, and in their relations with Egypt. Even with all the difficulties in the economy now being faced, I have complete confidence that in the end these problems will be resolved and we will see emerge a healthy, strong and developing Israeli economy with strong leadership there from Prime Minister Peres and his colleagues.

The Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty remain the cornerstone of our Middle East peace policy. Egypt has demonstrated its firm commitment to those accomplishments by repeatedly refusing to disavow them as a price for resuming its historic leadership role in the Arab world. Our assistance helps ensure that Egypt will remain strong enough to continue to resist the pressures of radical forces which seek to undo what has been achieved. Egypt remains an important force for moderation and stability not only in the Middle East but also in Africa, where it plays an important role in helping African states deter Libyan adventurism. Egypt's ability to continue this deterrent role depends heavily on our assistance. The FY 1986 Foreign Military Sales Program has been increased to enable Egypt to continue replacing obsolete Soviet equipment and remain a credible deterrent force in the region.

Another major U.S. interest in the Middle East is to maintain free world access to the vital oil supplies of the Persian Gulf now and in the future. The Persian Gulf countries produce over 25% of the free world's oil supply. Through our assistance, we help to improve the security of our friends in this area. Oman is cooperating closely with the U.S. toward our common goal of maintaining security and stability in that vital area and freedom of navigation through the Strait of Hormuz; Oman's agreement to permit access to its facilities represents a key asset for the U.S. Central Command. Although not recipients of U.S. financial assistance, the other Gulf states and Saudi Arabia, as members with Oman in the Gulf Cooperation Council, have shown the will and the ability to defend themselves against encroachment of the Iran-Iraq war. The Administration is embarking on a comprehensive review of our security interests and strategy in the area, focusing on how our various programs in the security field complement our efforts in the peace process and contribute to the general stability of the region.

In North Africa we have longstanding and close relationships with Morocco and Tunisia as firm friends and strategically located geo-political partners. Morocco, with whom we have transit and exercise agreements, and Tunisia are both in difficult economic circumstances. Our assistance program in Morocco, in concert with other donors, is designed to help the Moroccan Government as it implements necessary economic reforms. We have expressed to the Government of Morocco our disappointment over the unwelcome development of the Libya-Morocco treaty of August 1984. Qadhafi's aggression against neighboring states and his undiminished support of terrorism and subversion worldwide are continuing causes of concern. We have registered these concerns with the Moroccans and told them that we discount the possibility that association with King Hussan could influence Qadhafi constructively. Despite differing views on how to deal with Qadhafi, however, the economic and political rationale for this assistance to Morocco remains; indeed it is stronger.

South Asia

A major foreign policy objective in South Asia is to obtain a negotiated settlement to get the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan so that the refugees can return and Afghans can exercise their own sovereignty and independence. In our efforts to achieve this goal, it is vital that we help ensure the security of Pakistan in the face of Soviet intimidation. Our six-year assistance program for Pakistan serves this goal. It is designed to support Pakistan's economy and its development and to help strengthen its defense through provision of military equipmenit and training.

The U.S. has several important goals in South Asia. We seek to prevent conflict among the major states of the region; to help the region develop economically, and to foster the success of democratic institutions. India, the largest democracy in the world, plays a pivotal role in the peace and stability of the region. Our development assistance program for India will concentrate on more sophisticated research and higher technical training, building on India's strong scientific and technological base. Our asistance programs in Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal demonstrate U.S. support for the moderate non-aligned policies and economic development of these countries.

Europe

Security assistance proposals for the European region are designed to redress the military imbalance in Europe and counter the increased Soviet military threat in Central Europe and in Southwest Asia. The assistance supports key NATO allies and has the dual result of providing the U.S. with continued access to important military bases and helping these countries modernize their own military capabilities. By so doing, our security assistance sustains confidence in our best efforts commitments which are the foundation of base agreements.

U.S. foreign policy objectives in Spain are to support Spanish democracy, to encourage Spanish movement towards a more open economy, and to contribute to Western defense by assuring continued U.S. access to vital air and naval facilites in Spain. The security assistance programs plays a key role in achieving these objectives.

The Spanish military has assumed a role appropriate for armed forces in a democracy. Our assistance is necessary to help Spain meet its goal of modernization to NATO standards and to provide tangible evidence of the benefits Spain receives as a partner in the Western alliance, as demonstrated by its bilateral relationship with the U.S. as well as its participation in NATO. Our security assistance programs thus plays as important role in helping Spain to consolidate and strengthen its new democratic institutions.

Prime Minister Gonzalez' government has taken politically difficult steps to open Spain's traditionally protectionist economy to market forces. This decision was particularly courageous since Spain's economic austerity program has been accompanied by high unemployment. But as a result, the Spanish economy has shown impressive improvement in 1984. Its economic program would have placed a much more onerous burden on the Spanish people without our support. The security assistance program helps in modernizing the economy through scientific and technical exchanges and permits Spain to continue its economic recovery without jeopardizing its military modernization.

Our objectives in Portugal are similar to those in Spain. Portugal is striving to consolidate its 10-year-old democratic institutions while it assumes an expanded role in western political and military structures. It is also pursuing a demanding economic austerity program in an attempt to reform its troubled economy, which is the second poorest in western Europe. The U.S. security assistance program assists Portuguese economic development efforts and permits Portugal to continue its program of military modernization aimed at assuming expanded NATO defense responsibilities.

U.S. security assistance to Portugal therefore provides both real an symbolic support for Portugal's attmept to strengthen its democracy and free-market economy. Its provides a cornerstone for Portugal's attempts to play a more effective role in NATO. It also serves to meet the assistance goals to which the U.S. is committed under the 1983 agreement.

Our security assistance to Greece and Turkey contributes to important stragegic policy objectives on the southern flank of NATO. Turkey's position between the Soviet Union and the Middle East and proximity to southwest Asia make it a natural barrier to Soviet expansion into the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq War and the disintegration of Lebanon highlight the importance of a politically stable and militarily credible Turkish ally in this disturbed region. Also benefit from our military relationship with Turkey by our use of extremely valuable military and intelligence facilities. The United States accordingly has a compelling interest in enhancing Turkey's ability to meet its NATO committments and deter potential aggression in Southeast Asia through provision of security assistance.

Our interests are not confined to NATO security objectives. We have sought the cooperation of the Turkish Government in promoting a settlement on Cyprus. The Turkish Government accepted and supported the U.N. Secretary General's initiative. We are now working with all the parties to ensure that efforts in the wake of the recent summit in New York to reach a settlement between the Government of Cyprus

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

and the Turkish Cypriot community can move forward. Accordingly, we believe that any attempt at one-sided efforts to impose conditions regarding Cyprus on security assistance to Turkey would not only be unwarranted but would set back the prospects of a settlement on Cyprus.

On the economic side, Turkey has taken far-reaching and courageous steps to stabilize and liberalize its economy. U.S. concessional aid to Turkey is directly and constructively related to Turkey's efforts to create freer and more sound economy.

We are also seeking a substantial level of security assistance of Greece. We have our diferences with the Greek government. We want a better relationship with Greece, but the Greek government has to do its part as well. We recognize Greece's strategic importance in the eastern Mediterranean. We derive important benefits from our miltiary facilities. Our security assistance program is an important element in our relationship with Greece. It is exceeded only by our request for Israel, Egypt, Turkey and Pakistan.

East Asia and Pacific

Foreign assistance is an investment in the future that can benefit both recipient and donor. This is particularly evident in the East Asia and Pacific region where the returns paid on our foreign assistance investment have been enormous. For some 20 years East Asian countries have achieved higher economic growth rates than any other region of the world. They have achieved these remarkable results principally by relying on the dynamism of free market systems. As a result of this rapid economic growth, the region now accounts for more of our foreign trade than any other region of the world. Since former aid recipients in the region have reached the stage of development where they no longer need bilateral aid, and in some cases have become aid donors themselves, East Asia and Pacific countries now account for only a small portion of our worldwide assistance programs despite the vital importance of the region to the United States.

In spite of this generally bright picture, the region still has pressing economic and security problems that we must confront. The Administration's FY 1986 foreign assistance request for East Asia and the Pacific that addresses these problems totals approximately $818 million. The requested economic assistance of $335 million will be concentrated in the three largest members of the Association of South East Asian Nations, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand. The bulk of the $483 million requested for military assistance will go to deter direct military threats to Korea and Thailand and to enhance our close military relationship with the Philippines, a treaty ally. We also propose modest assistance programs in other ASEAN countries, in Burma, a country that has become increasingly important to our anti-narcotics efforts, and in the islands of the South Pacific. I would like to highlight some of our specific concerns.

The Philippines has passed through difficult times that have adversely affected the economy. The government has begun to take corrective measures and has concluded an economic stabilization agreement with the International Monetary Fund. These actions are encouraging, but more has to be done to turn the economy around. The Philippine situation is further clouded by a growing armed insurgency by the New People's Army, the military arm of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which has been able to exploit the country's political, economic, and social difficulties. The revitalization of democratic institutions, the establishment of long-term growth through structural economic reform, the maintenance of our vital security relationship, and the successful resistance to a communist takeover of the Philippines are intertwined. Our integrated economic and military assistance program is designed to support all of these objectives.

Like the Philippines, Thailand is a treaty ally of the United States. It is also a frontline state that faces serious security challenges caused by Soviet supported Vietnamese aggression in neighboring Cambodia. Our security assistance to Thailand supports the government's efforts to improve social and economic conditions in the war-affected Thai-Cambodian border areas that have experieneed a large influx of refugees because of continued brutal attacks by Vietnam. The on-going Vietnamese military offensive along the Thai-Cambodian border and frequent Vietnamese forays into Thailand underscore the importance of modernizing Thailand's defense forces to provide a deterrent to further Vietnamese aggression.

The specific efforts of the Philippines and Thailand are reinforced by their membership in ASEAN, which represents the best hope for peace and stability in Southeast Asia. Consistent with our strong support for ASEAN and in recognition of the importance of our relationship with Indonesia, we have also proposed economic and military assistance for that nation. Indonesia has continued to make good progress in its development program and maintaining sound economic policies in the face of an international recession. Our military sales to Indonesia have enhanced our common strategic interests in Southeast Asia. We also plan to continue the ASEAN regional technical assistance program. In another ASEAN member, Malaysia, where U.S. private investment continues to be a major catalyst of economic growth and development, the government has expressed interest in continued defense cooperation with the United States within the context of that nation's nonaligned status. Malaysia has played a constructive role in international affairs and has forcefully advanced ASEAN's strategy to bring about a withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia. We propose to continue our modest military assistance program in support of these efforts.

Another important U.S. treaty ally is the Republic of Korea. The prevention of North Korean aggression against South Korea is indispensable for peace and stability in the region and important to our own security. So far we have been successful in deterring aggression and preventing a recurrence of hostilities on the Korean peninsula. To maintain our support for the U.S.-ROK alliance we propose to continue an FMS credit program that will permit the ROK to improve the capabilities of its combat forces, many of which are stationed with our own forces along the DMZ and would operate with us under a joint command in time of war.

I now want to emphasize the importance the Administration places on proposed legislative action that will require no additional appropriation under the bill you are considering. Our expanding economic, scientific, and cultural ties with China have been mutually beneficial and have become a very important element in our overall relationship. Consistent with this growing friendly relationship, the President has sought changes to laws that link China with the Soviet bloc. I am pleased to note that, with your support, important progress was made in this effort. Last year we proposed the elimination of the prohibition on assistance to China to permit us the flexibility to provide some assistance—such as training—if we so chose. This proposal was approved in both the House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees. The overall bill was not passed, however, for reasons unrelated to China. To remove this anachronism in our laws affecting China, I ask you to pass this proposal this year.

Multilateral development programs

Thus far I have stressed the vital role American bilateral assistance plays in promoting the security and stability of the developing world. As I am sure each of you appreciates, this task is far too great for one country to attempt to do alone. Fortunately, we do not have to. Our friends and allies in the industrialized world devote a considerable amount of their resources to the task of promoting the development process, which in turn yields dividends in the expansion of economic trade and strengthening of democratic institutions. These resources are becoming too scarce to allow for inefficient use of any kind. A coordinated approach among donors has always been desirable. It is now critical.

The principal tool available for such coordination is the pooling of a portion of our economic assistance through the multilateral development banks (MDBs) and the development programs of the United Nations and the Organization of the American States. MDB lending remains a significant and growing source of investment capital for developing countries. In FY 84, MDBs together committed $22 billion in new loans. That a lending program of this size was sustained with a U.S. paid-in contribution of $1.3 billion testifies to the advantages of using the MDBs to share the burden of providing aid. The U.S. benefits directly from the MDBs efforts to promote strong and sustained progress in the developing countries through increased sales of U.S. goods and services. Indeed, a significant portion of the U.S. trade deficit can be attributed to the decline in purchases by debt-troubled developing countries, a decline which appropriate development assistance can help reverse.

While valuable as a source of development finance, the MDBs play an equally critical role by providing sound market-oriented economic policy advice to their borrowers. They also impose financial discipline on the development objectives of their clients. These institutions are devoting increasing resources to projects and programs designed to support private enterprise in the developing world. For many years, the World Bank's special affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, has focussed on the specific needs of the private sector. The regional development banks are beginning to follow the World Bank's lead. The strengthened commitment on the part of these institutions to private enterprise may prove to be one of the most important factors in supporting a successful development process.

We are convinced that the MDBs have a crucial role to play in advancing world-wide growth and development, and increasing the private sector contribution to that process. We thus consider our participation in them a necessary complement to our bilateral assistance policy. In recent years this Administration, acting in close consultation with the Congress, has sought to reduce the cost to us of providing an effective level of support to these institutions, while maintaining U.S. leadership. We have been successful in negotiating overall replenishment levels which we believe are adequate to the needs of borrowing members but also take into consideration our budgetary constraints. Maintaining U.S. leadership, however, depends on our meeting these obligations in a

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

timely manner. I, therefore, urge Congress to support fully both our FY 86 request for $1.3 billion.

The United Nations and OAS programs for development also make valuable contributions to the development process. The role of institutions such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Food Program (WFP), and UNICEF have complemented our bilateral efforts. We support these programs and continuously and forcefully seek to improve their effectiveness and efficiency.

SUMMARY

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize the basic theme of this year's budget presentation. We have a responsibility to stick with the policies that have worked or begun to work. Quick fixes, pulling back from the fray, or hoping for diplomatic miracles are not responsible options. But if we stand together, firmly, predictably and realistically defending our principles and our friends, and do so in the steadfast manner the problems require, then we can prevail. Our FY 1986 budget request is designed to do just that.●

APRIL 1985 AS FAIR HOUSING MONTH

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 79, which designates the month of April as "Fair Housing Month". Fairness is something we should be concerned about not just during the month of April, but throughout the year as well. The principle embodied in this resolution reflects the best of traditional American values.

The promise of decent shelter has been an enduring dream for all Americans, but the reality for many has been otherwise. The Fair Housing Act protects the right of free choice in the housing market. The Federal Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Housing discrimination must not, and will not, be tolerated. We must continue our commitment to this right for all.

A continuing commitment to this principle demands that we recognize the 17th anniversary of the enactment of the Fair Housing Act—title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968. However, our commitment to the elimination of housing discrimination must continue beyond the month of April.●

RESEARCH AWARDS

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 69 on February 28 which would reverse an OMB directive to reduce the number of research awards to be made by the National Institutes of Health. The Office of Management and Budget has requested NIH to ignore the congressional mandate to fund 6,500 new and competing research grants this year and fund only 5,000—a level actually below the fiscal year 1984 and 1983 levels.

I want to point out to my colleagues that a similar situation also applies to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. OMB has directed ADAMHA to reduce the number of research grants it will be permitted to fund this year from 583 to 500. I regret that my resolution did not refer to research grants within ADAMHA because I feel that Congress would agree that its funding mandate has been thwarted for this agency as well.

The need for parity in congressional support for biomedical and behavorial research has long been recognized. We must insist on an evenhanded approach in dealing with appropriations issues concerning NIH and ADAMHA because of the interdependence on critical research breakthroughs in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases in both areas.

Reducing the number of new and competing research grants in NIH and ADAMHA would seriously disrupt the Nation's research activities which are critical to improving the health of the American people. It is contrary to clear funding decisions made by the Congress in Public Law 98-619, and those decisions should not be circumvented by administrative fiat.

Mr. President, my efforts to ensure the power administration of laws that Congress enacts are directed at restoring research support for both biomedical and behavioral research.●

FORTY YEARS AFTER YALTA

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it has been four decades since President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin met at Yalta and signed the Yalta agreements.

Recently, two leaders of the Polish-American Congress of my home State of Delaware—Angela C. Turochy, honorary president and Jesse W. Samluk, president—expressed to me their continued concern that 40 years later both the spirit and the letter of the 1945 Yalta agreements have not been carried out.

The Yalta agreements "Declaration On Liberated Europe," stated "liberated people" must be allowed processes that will enable them "to create democratic institutions of their own choice * * *." The declaration notes that its guiding principle is "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. * * *"

The situation that has since developed in postwar Eastern Europe clearly indicates that the Soviet Union had no intention of carrying out the promises made in the agreements. They pledged "the earliest possible establishment through free election of Governments responsive to the will of people," but that has never happened in the countries which they liberated during World War II. No environment of political and national freedom exists today in areas under the domination of the Soviet Union. No East European Government is the product of any legitimate democratic process. From the beginning the Soviets have sought to impose on Eastern Europe their own sociopolitical system, one which has little popular support. The uprisings and continued ferment in Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary leave little doubt of this.

I wholeheartedly empathize with and understand the frustrations of my friends in the Delaware Polish Congress. We in the Senate must continue to do all we can to push each successive administration to pressure the Soviet Union to fulfill its neglected promises made at the Yalta Conference. Fostering legitimate democracies in Eastern Europe should be a high priority of every administration. Sovereign rights and self-government should be restored to those people who have been forcibly deprived.

At every opportunity and at every international forum, including the recently convened arms control talks in Geneva, the administration should be raising with the Soviets the issue of the Yalta agreements, thereby showing our solidarity with the peoples of Eastern Europe.

This is not a partisan matter. The administration should use all means available to press the Soviets to carry out its commitments under the Yalta agreements. The peoples of Eastern Europe must be allowed—in the words of the Yalta Conference Declaration—to solve "by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems. * * *"●

MINNESOTA SALUTE TO LOUISE WHITBECK FRASER COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC.

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, for the past 50 years, mentally delayed and retarded individuals and their families have benefitted from the caring services provided by what is now known as the Louise Whitbeck Fraser Community Services, Inc.

In those 50 years, the well-known community institution in surburban Minneapolis has grown from a home-study program involving seven students to a well-rounded program encompassing a $1.5 million facility with more than 40 staff members and dozens of volunteers who care for approximately 100 children and adults.

Sensing the need to broaden its focus, Louis Whitbeck Fraser Community Services has, in the recent years, branched out to serve adults and to provide a large number of services to both children and adults in their home environments.

Because of the outstanding contributions made by Louise Whitbeck Fraser Community Services, I ask that the following two articles noting the organization's 50th anniversary which were published recently in the Richfield Sun-Current be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6

FRASER SCHOOL: 50 YEARS OF HELPING HANDICAPPED

(By Judy Rothschadl)

At 8 a.m. it's rush hour at Whitbeck Fraser schools.

Coffee is steaming, staff and volunteers file in and disappear into classrooms, tiny chairs are set aright, miniature dining services are stacked for play time. Down the hallway leading to the executive director's office come armfuls of balloons and paper streamers.

"We're trying to surprise him, explained Lane Dexter, director of program development at Louise Whitbeck Fraser Community Services Inc., 2400 W. 64th St., Richfield, Executive Director Robert Kowalczyk's birthday is three days away. Chances are he won't be expecting a party.

Dexter is trim, tan and looks more like a student teacher than a 20-year veteran of the school.

"It's not always this busy, but pretty close," she said.

Traffic and enthusiasm have risen recently in expectation of the school's 50th anniversary—the kickoff was a fashion show fund-raiser this past weekend at the downtown Hyatt Regency. Celebrities showing support for the school by modeling at the fashion gala included 1976 Miss U.S.A. Barbara Peterson-Burwell, former Minnesota Gov. Wendell Anderson, and Erica Bouza, wife of Minneapolis Police Chief Tony Bouza.

Besides a birthday, the service organization for developmentally delayed and mentally retarded children and adults is also undergoing its third name change. Founded in 1935 by Richfield resident Louise Whitbeck Fraser (see accompanying article), the school was known for 32 years as Home Study School.

In 1967 it was renamed to honor Fraser as Louise Whitbeck Fraser School Inc. Because of growth and diversity, the school is again being rechristened, this time as Louise Whitbeck Fraser Community Services Inc.

The service has grown over a half century from a home-study program involving seven students to encompass a $1.5 million facility with some 40 staff members and leagues of volunteers caring for approximately 100 children and adults.

Three divisions comprise the non-profit, private service facility: the Fraser School for handicapped children aged 6 weeks to 6 years; the Whitbeck Nursery School, offering licensed daycare and nursery services to non-handicapped preschoolers; and the Muriel Humphrey Residence Program, added in 1977 to serve mentally retarded adults.

The Fraser and Whitbeck schools are housed in the 2400 W. 64th St. facility. Each is staffed separately with special education instructors and therapists who work one-on-one with children. Handicapped infants are visited in their homes by specialists who work with both the child and parents. When the children are older, they come in to the school facility to work with instructors and music, speech, occupation and corrective therapists.

Lori Bird, special education instructor at Fraser School, explained that the children have mental or physical handicaps, some correctable, some permanent.

The key to helping them, staff members agree, is early intervention, getting professional help as soon as possible.

"The sooner we get them," Bird said, "the more we can help them."

The school also looks after "normal" children. Although normal and handicapped kids have separate staffs, the children have a tendancy to mingle.

Dexter said the mixing of the two groups has mutual benefits. The disabled children learn more by playing with unimpaired peers, who serve as models. The "normal" kids learn to accept peers with disabilities.

"It's a good place to start as far as kids learning how to deal with other types of people in their world," Dexter said.

On the other range of services, the organization provides for mentally retarded adults through the Muriel Humphrey Residence Program. Residence homes offer a family atmosphere and are staffed with a live-in counselor couple, a program specialist with assistant, and weekend relief counselors to provide constant support.

Whitbeck Fraser Community Services Inc. falls under the jurisdiction of Hennepin County social services and is one of eight developmental achievement centers serving the Hennepin metro area. It is 85 percent funded through tuition paid by parents eligible for government financial assistance. Fees are based on income and range from zero to $300 a month. Other funding sources are private foundations and companies.

With the recent "tightening" of government and private funding, the school is seizing the occasion of its 50th anniversary to remind the community of its services. A whole array of activities is being planned, including open houses, to begin in earnest this coming fall.

Kowalczyk said the school is unique not only for its ability to survive through changing community needs, but also because of its unique methodology. Although other schools for the handicapped use music therapy, Fraser was a pioneer in the approach.

"Fraser discovered you could take a hyperactive child and through a controlled setting, starting with more involved music and leading to more passive music, the child could be calmed," he said.

Fraser learned to seize these moments of calm, he explained, to introduce a lesson. Sometimes the calm lasted only half a minute, but it was enough to start a learning process.

Music is only one part of the education program at Whitbeck Fraser. On the morning of Kowalczyk's birthday party, kids were huddled in giggling gaggles from one end of the building to the other, engrossed in exercises to push their tiny hands and minds toward new horizons.

One huddle in the nursery appeared to be cleaning up after a make-believe tea party. Across the hall a Goldilocks-type was beaming after fitting together a block puzzle. A trio in therapy smiled sheepishly after maneuvering a ball into a small tin can.

It looked like fun, yet Dexter said each activity was also helping develop specific mental and physical skills. She pointed to a group of retarded children gleefully mashing mounds of shaving cream and Rice Krispies. The exercise helped fine-tune touch perceptions. One child let out a squeal.

"Some don't like the feel of the Rice Krispies," Dexter said.

Some children take months or years to learn a simple skill. Some never learn. But every so often—often enough—there is a success, maybe as simple as a child learning to bring a cracker to his mouth with his right hand.

"We can never make brain damage go away," Bird said. "But we can help them learn things people didn't used to think they could learn—to help themselves—to make a better life."

SCHOOL FOUNDER HAD A WAY WITH KIDS AND ADULTS

(By Judy Rothschadl)

It was another long day in a hard life for Louise Whitbeck Fraser.

At just 32 years old, she had been widowed when her husband, Allen, was shot and killed on the day he was to retire from a dangerous secret service job. Prior to that tragedy, a son, Robert, had been killed in a freak auto accident. And a daughter, Mary Lou, was struck down by a staph infection as she was about to launch a law career.

Fraser was left on her own to raise a remaining son, Wesley, and a daughter, Jean, who became deaf after a bout with spinal meningitis.

Fifty years ago it was not uncommon for children with physical disabilities to be diagnosed as mentally retarded. But Fraser, a trained commercial artist and elementary school teacher, was determined to keep Jean at home and teach the child herself, even though doctors recommended institutionalization.

Jean, described as a "terror," was straining her mother's patience on this particular day. Perhaps out of frustration, Fraser plopped the child down alongside a phonograph and to her surprise Jean suddenly stopped struggling. For a precious moment a calm descended in the Fraser home.

"She couldn't tell if it was the music, movement of the record going round and round or the sound of the bass," explained Robert Kowalczyk, executive director at Whitbeck Fraser Community Services Inc. "But she thought there had to be more to it."

Kowalczyk, speaking from memory of past converstations with Mrs. Fraser (now deceased), said from those surprised beginnings, the Whitbeck Fraser School founder went on to pioneer special education therapy for children that was almost unheard of 50 years ago.

Fraser developed techniques for music therapy that became the subject of countless professional journal articles. And her special way of handling handicapped children led to a growing number of requests from area parents with similar problem children.

In 1935 Fraser officially opened her home as a school called Home Study School, 5019 38th Ave. S., Minneapolis, with seven pupils. Each year the number of students rose, from 25 in 1939 to 60 in 1960. Staff and services were added while the facility outgrew six different locations. In 1967 a new $300,000 building was constructed at the school's present site at 2400 W. 64th St., Richfield, and in 1971 an addition was completed, finishing off a $1.5 million special education complex, serving approximately 100 area handicapped children and adults.

Remembering Fraser now on the occasion of the school's 50th anniversary, Kowalczyk smiles frequently. His boss, mentor and friend—who started the program in her living room—died eight years ago at age 81.

What kind of woman could survive severe family trauma and go on to found a school for children who sometimes require more attention than a single body can give?

According to Kowalczyk, she had an intuitive sense about what her school needed. After a single, brief meeting with him, she was determined to hire Kowalczyk, whom she talked into leaving a comfortable post at Anoka State Hospital.

"She had a lot of charm with people," said Pam Jurdy-Juul, the school's director of infant programming, "the kind of charm you don't see much these days."

Approved For Release 2010/10/14 : CIA-RDP87B00858R000600940038-6